

REMARKS

The Office action dated November 30, 2005, and the references cited therein have been received and carefully reviewed in light of the examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

As a result of the Office action, a number of objections on formal grounds are raised in connection with claims 1, 2, and 5, which objections are believed to have been overcome by the above amendments in accordance with the examiner's suggestions. No new matter has been added.

Moreover, claims 1 and 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,457,450 to Deese in view of U.S. 6,856,344 to Franz. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deese in view of Franz, and further in view of U.S. 5,898,389 to Deese. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicant's invention as now claimed. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

According to MPEP 2143.03, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In order to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art

combination, Applicant has amended claim 1 to further define the LED traffic light device's shape and configuration as illustrated in FIG. 3. The LED traffic light includes a housing having a pair of concentric circular portions creating a main lighting area within the perimeter of the inner circle and a second lighting area within the annular portion between the inner circle and the outer circle. As described in the specification on page 7, lines 1-15, the length of the illuminated area between the inner circle and outer circle gradually becomes shorter in a counter clockwise direction signaling that the traffic signal device is about to change from displaying one traffic signal to another.

None of the prior art references, taken individually or in combination, teaches or discloses these limitations. For example, the '450 reference teaches a conventional traffic signal wherein the incandescent light bulbs for the red, yellow, and green lights are replaced with an array of LEDs. Therefore, in view of foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over the prior art.

Claims 2-8 are dependent from claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

The prior art references made of record by the examiner have each been considered but are not believed to obviate against the allowability of the claims as amended. It is

noted that none of these references have been specifically applied by the examiner against any of the original claims.

Each issue raised in the Office action dated November 30, 2005, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 1-8 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ,
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD

By: 

Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16

Date: 2/27/06